

From: Thom
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:55 PM
Subject: planned rules changes

What a horrible, uncorrectable mistake it would be for FCC to make rules changes allowing for media monopoly. Our democracy depends on a diversity of ideas and freedom of speech. Any additional consolidation would allow a very small base of huge corporate powers to control the news, ideas and information.

We abhor the lack of "freedoms" in other countries. Therefore, we must be vigilant to protect our own country from abuse of power if only a few corporations are allowed to control what information citizens receive and rely on.

Therefore, I strongly oppose changes in FCC rules.

Roma Thomas
20425 133rd Drive
Sun City West, AZ 85375
623-546-2561

From: Katherine A. Browning
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:56 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation oppose

Dear Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation
Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.
Sincerely,
Katherine Browning

From: Gail Cirata
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5 56 PM
Subject: Pending Deregulation

I have only just become aware of the FCC's pending vote on further deregulation of the media
I can only think this is a sad thing for our country
When I was in school I was taught that the airwaves were for the people and the FCC had the
responsibility of regulating them
The media is so monopolized by corporate and commercial business that I simply cannot believe the FCC
would consider further deregulation
I sincerely hope the commissioners of the FCC will consider the people of the United States and the
airwaves that we thought belonged to us
Please keep them open to all and not owned and programmed only by the corporations
We all lose with more deregulation
With deregulation lose our artists, our culture, our creativity, our independence
Most sincerely,

Gail

Gail Cirata, Broker-Associate
SUN CITY LINCOLN HILLS
PH 800-483-4834 x7515
Direct Line 916-434-7515
Email gcirata@delwebb.com
Fax 916-434-7509

From: Katherine A Browning
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:58 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation OPPOSE

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin,
Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation
Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely,
Katherine Browning

From: Marissa Madrigal
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:59 PM
Subject: No consolidation!

Dr. Ms. Abernathy,

On behalf of myself and family, I would like to express worry about the consideration of lifting rules concerning media ownership. Please do not vote in favor of further consolidation. The lack of diversity in ownership has made the airwaves less and less accessible to "common" citizens.

Would Bob Dylan ever get airplay on Clear Channel today?

Many thanks

M. Madrigal and Family

From: Thom
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6 12 PM
Subject: FCC rules changes

Re: Planned FCC Rules Changes

I strongly oppose changes in FCC rules

It would be a horrible, uncorrectable mistake for FCC to make rules changes allowing for media monopoly. Our democracy depends on a diversity of ideas and freedom of speech. Any additional consolidation would allow a very small base of huge corporate powers to control the news, ideas and information.

We abhor the lack of "freedoms" in other countries. Therefore, we must be vigilant to protect our own country from abuse of power if only a few corporations are allowed to control what information citizens receive and rely on. Diversity of ideas is always needed to maintain a free society.

Roma Thomas
20425 133rd Drive
Sun City West, AZ 85375
623-546-2561

From: Stanandpaul@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6:13 PM
Subject: concentration of media organisations

I am opposed to any changes in FCC regulations that allow further concentration of media organizations (TV, radio, newspapers, etc.) in the hands of the current media giants. Let us not further undermine our ability to have multiple points of view. To do so threatens the strength of our democracy.

Respectfully, Dr. Stanley Tannenbaum

From: pamelaba hosler
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6 24 PM
Subject: proposed changes

Dear Commissioners

I understand you are considering some HUGE changes, allowing the same company to own newspapers, radios & television stations in short, allowing consolidation, and even a monopoly ownership of the media. What a terrible prospect! It's hard enough to get adequate news coverage, even now a lot of the news is "fluff" because the advertisers don't want their product seen next to news of "substance". People with power already prevent significant stories from "making news". Have you ever read Censored 2000 or Censored 2001? Please do! There are so many examples of stories that already have been squashed, and an analysis of the consequences we are already seeing with the consolidation of ownership that has taken place so far.

A democracy is only a democracy if the people are informed, and we can only be informed if we can get accurate news. Having multiple sources of information helps the cause in the same way that having competition among companies helps in inspiring better products at a lower cost.

Shame on you for even considering this consolidation allowance that would be sure to undermine the quality of our news! You are supposed to be looking out for the common citizen, people like me!

You have a great deal of power in the vote ahead of you. Vote this revision down! Please make the preservation of having multiple sources of news for the betterment of our democracy your priority.

With deep concern,
Pamela Hosler
pamelabahosl@hotmail.com

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*

From: Ss11s@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6:27 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003

I am an ordinary citizen. But like most American citizens I take the continuance of our democracy very seriously. It is essential that you reject any proposal that will result in the consolidation of media into fewer hands. This consolidation is a direct threat to our democracy in that it narrows the amount of voices available to the American people. In the name of all that is sacred please do not give away the freedoms that our ancestors died for.

Thank You,
Dan Frenette
9730 N. 56th Dr.
Glendale, AZ 85303
email: ss11s@aol.com

From: Jules Goldstein
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6 34 PM
Subject: FCC decision on June 2

Commissioner Abernathy

I urge you not to weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media

Relaxing the rules for media ownership would allow one company to own the local newspaper, several TV and radio stations, and the cable TV system in the same community. There would be fewer owners of networks, stations, and newspapers nationwide.

Media ownership would be concentrated among fewer companies, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints would be compromised. Plus, it would likely result in higher costs for businesses that advertise in local media, and those costs would likely be passed onto consumers.

Americans understand that the public interest is NOT being served by deregulation that reduces competition. Please re-instate the traditional media ownership rules for the sake of competition and democracy.

Sincerely,
Janice Goldstein
111 Cambridge St
St. Paul, MN 55105

From: Jack Daane
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6 40 PM
Subject: Bust Media Ownership Monopoly

To: Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Chairman Michael K. Powell mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein jadelste@fcc.gov

From: Jack Daane
355 North Fremont Street
San Mateo, CA 94401-1831 jackdaane@earthlink.net

Subject: Bust Media Ownership Monopoly

Date: May 3, 2003

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is threatening to further increase the number of television stations, radio stations, satellite broadcast systems, magazines, and newspapers a single company can own. I am opposed to this increase.

Too few companies own our country's airwaves, newspapers, and magazines today. This gives them far too much propaganda power.

Reduce the number of outlets one company can own, don't increase it. Extend the June 2, 2003 deadline for public comments.

Please serve the citizens of the United States of America, not the corporations.

No response is necessary, but if you do wish to respond, e-mail is most convenient. jackdaane@earthlink.net

Sincerely,

Jack Daane

From: jhsieser@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6:49 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please do not ease the broadcast ownership regulations that protect the American citizens from media monopolies. Americans do not want the media to control television and radio news with their particular slanted bias, keeping opposing views off the air.
Thank you,
Jerry Sieser

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Sophiesgirl79029@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:08 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Leslie H. Wilson
Sophiesgirl79029@aol.com

From: AGStires
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jabelste@fcc.gov, FCC FCCINFO, Mike Powell, Jon Corzine, Pascrell Bill, Lautenberg Senator [Lautenberg]
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:11 PM
Subject: Please do not vote for more deregulations on 6/2/03

Hello

Please do all you can to stop further deregulation for the media on June 2, 2003. It would allow the creation of an oligarchy by enabling a few corporations to buy up and consolidate all of what remains of independent news sources including television, radio, internet, and print media.

Already, only a handful of corporate giants own the commercial television channels, movie production companies, radio, and print sources. Already, the voices Americans hear are modified to further the agenda of corporate giants and the politicians they fund. Uninformed listeners assume that the information they get from news programs is unbiased. They are relying on being protected by the regulations of the FCC. Those regulations will no longer be there.

The airways belong to the people. To obtain a license to use them requires that the public interests be served and that carefully thought out regulations be adhered to. These regulations were developed to protect our democracy. Use of them to further certain business and political interests does not serve the public. Our democracy is threatened when only a few voices are heard. The airways must be available for full public discussion and debate, and to inform local communities of issues vital to their well being. Reporting on emergencies is an example. Currently, there is so little staff in many radio stations that there is literally no one to answer the phone and set up local coverage of a public service message.

I am not for runaway growth of government. But there are places where government must be strong. Making certain that all voices can be heard is a government function that must be enforced through the FCC. Again, please do all you can to stop further deregulation of the airways on June 2nd.

Thank you and God bless

Anne Stires
1 Ann Street
Verona, NJ 07044

From: Sophiesgirl79029@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:11 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner

Dear Mr. Copps,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Leslie H. Wilson
Sophiesgirl79029@aol.com

From: Isaac Cohen
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7 19 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership

Dear Mr. Abernathy,

The proposed changes in the broadcast ownership rules may effectively give media conglomerates virtually total control over the broadcast of information in general and news in particular

I therefore urge you NOT TO RELAX the rules that protect the public from media monopolies

Sincerely,

Isaac Cohen

1171 Carll's Straight Path

Dix Hills, NY 11746

From: Carl Young
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7 21 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Honorable Lady and Gentleman,

It has been brought to my attention as a Business owner and 2nd amendment rights respecer that Big corporations or conglomerate are trying to mislead you into believing that they have the right answer for gun owners

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media to gain control of radio and television news and information in communities

across our great nation Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing views off the air

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom,I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure political debate in our country With sincere gratitude for what you all do for us! One Small Business owner, Carl F Young

IncrediMail - Email has finally evolved - [Click Here](#)

From: Isaac Cohen
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7 24 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership

Dear Mr. Copps,

The proposed changes in the broadcast ownership rules may effectively give media conglomerates virtually total control over the broadcast of information in general and news in particular

I therefore urge you NOT TO RELAX the rules that protect the public from media monopolies

Sincerely,

Isaac Cohen

1171 Carll's Straight Path

Dix Hills, NY 11746

From: BAKienzle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:28 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and TV news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing views off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, has helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
Richard L. Kienzle,
Duluth, MN 55803

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMW, Commissioner Adelstein

From: BAKienzle@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:28 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and TV news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing views off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Kienzle,
Duluth, MN 55803

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KMJMW, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Fern Leopold
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:36 PM
Subject: Concentrating media ownership

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am aghast at learning about possible changes to the FCC regulations which will allow a communications company to own most or all of the sources of news in a community. The regulations currently in effect are serving the public well and should not be tampered with for private gain or power.

The public airways belong to the public. We are not served when the sources of our information fall into fewer and fewer hands. If a company could control what we see on TV and the Internet and also what we read in the newspapers, it could propagate any falsehoods, omit critical news, or give us the most slanted coverage without our being the wiser.

Please do not abdicate your responsibility to administer the FCC fairly. Our very democracy is at peril unless you do so.

Very worriedly yours,

Fern L. Leopold
21284 Plaza View Drive
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

From: Roderick Briggs
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:37 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Dear Commissioner Copps

We agree with your views on diversity of ownership, and want the FCC to carry out its mission to preserve the public airwaves for the public interest. Consequently, we have sent the following letter to Chairman Powell and the other three commissioners by U.S. mail rather than e-mail, hoping a written letter will carry more weight in convincing them to follow your lead in asking for more public input before voting on media consolidation. We see our country falling increasingly under the power of corporate interests. We want that trend to stop, if at all possible, and act accordingly. We hope it helps. Thank you for your service and speeches to preserve diversity.

"Dear -----

We object to the lack of public input on the proposed vote at your June 2, 2003, meeting of the FCC to relax restrictions on consolidation of media ownership. Not only have there been insufficient public hearings on these unspecified proposals, as reported in the press, but the whole movement toward deregulation of broadcast TV is abhorrent to me and my wife.

Over our lifetimes, we have seen the time allotments for commercials per hour triple. In addition, the public used to have some power over a radio and/or TV station by exercising its rights to comment when its license renewal came up. Stations had to meet a minimum of hours devoted to the public interest, and a license could be denied if a station was found wanting in its children's programming, time devoted to public issues, etc. Laws had some teeth in them, and seemed to be enforced. Equal time for both sides was required when elections rolled around. If one party or candidate was given access to listeners or viewers, the opposition had to be given equal access. Station ownership was restricted, so that diverse views and political opinion could be encouraged. The premise was that the public airwaves were owned by the public, NOT corporate entities. The FCC was established and run to guarantee that the public interest was served while still allowing private control of programming, so diverse viewpoints could be expressed from which the public could then form its opinions. We commercialized the public airwaves, but required some minimum standards to restrict exploitation of public property.

The consolidation of ownership in recent years, allowed by Congress, the FCC and the courts is detrimental to democracy. We the public are inundated with ever longer, louder, and more intrusive commercials. Programming comes from an ever declining number of sources, most of which are controlled by a very restricted number of corporate producers and/or opinion shapers. Where is a diversity of views to come from if these trends continue? Cable does not provide for diversity. There may be 20 cable channels with differing identities, but they all have the same source, a single corporate entity with a single minded viewpoint or theme. The FCC must draw the line against this trend toward monopoly in

the media and airwaves

For instance, if a single corporation owns two broadcast stations and a newspaper in a single city, three news outlets may appear to be functioning, but in reality, only one management is determining what stories are aired or printed, and one management is exercising its editorial judgment. There are three entities, but only one viewpoint, perhaps even only one consolidated news gathering and editorial staff being used. The public is not being adequately served. And if the other stations in the city are equally consolidated by corporations with views similar to the first example, the public only receives a single message, erroneously implying that only one viewpoint exists on questions of political, economic, or social importance. This is not democracy. Rather, it leans toward totalitarian thought control. Its closest parallel would be Benito Mussolini's pioneering use of government policy for corporate interests in Italy during the 1920s, otherwise known as Fascism, later copied by Hitler, with Joseph Goebbels monopolizing all sources of information, newspaper, radio, etc. This became known as propaganda.

We both demand and plead that the FCC encourage diversity, not restrict it. The FCC must fulfill its mission to act in the PUBLIC interest, not take away the public airwaves and hand them over to a few corporations who can spend the most on lobbying in Washington! Save our public airwaves for the public, not private interests!

Thank you for your service and consideration of the above comments

Sincerely,

Lois Briggs
Roderick E. Briggs"

From: Jerry Taylor
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:40 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation Issue

Sir,

I have seen you interviewed by Bill Moyers on his PBS program NOW during which you discussed the upcoming Media Consolidation vote. I have to say that I have not seen any other media coverage of this issue, and have only seen one other comment, yours, to the USC Media Ownership Forum. I live in a small rural town in mid-Michigan but am a retired federal employee with extensive travel and service throughout this country. I have seen the media bias in most of our large cities, including Washington DC, and rarely has there been any public outcry against it. I believe strongly that if further consolidation of the American media business is allowed that the American people will be sorely used and abused by the moguls this consolidation will create.

I am reminded of a TV program from the 1980's, Max Headroom, in which the main characters were news reporters in a not too distant future Chicago. They worked for one of two TV networks. The premise of the show was how the media controlled the news and forced the public what it wanted them to know, rather than a broad spectrum of news which they could use to make decisions. This led to all political power being subordinated to the media, which in many respects is happening today.

I would also like to point out that in every country where the media is controlled and censored the people are oppressed and have very limited political power. Examples: the former USSR, China, Taiwan, most South American countries and the Middle East.

My concern is that our future will be decided by businessmen whose only interest is the profit they generate rather than the openness and security of America. It is disturbing to think also that foreign media organizations could buy up more of the US media infrastructure and then feed into the US their own agenda without regard for our concerns, further distorting news and other programming for their own national gain.

What I am saying in perhaps too roundabout a way is that such consolidation will lead to commercial censorship on a massive scale. Something we are seeing now with the mainstream media in the US ignoring, or refusing to cover this issue because their corporate executives, who see landslide profits in it, have ordered them not to.

I therefore ask you to vote against this rule change, or delay it until further investigation, public commentary and legal rulings can be obtained.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this comment.

Respectfully, Jerry K. Taylor

From: Fern Leopold
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:40 PM
Subject: Changing FCC Regulations

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I am sending you a copy of an e-mail I just sent to Mr. Powell because I want someone else on your committee to hear my voice.

Please do not vote for the changes in FCC regulations which have served us all so well for so many years. Fern Leopold

The copy follows.

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am aghast at learning about possible changes to the FCC regulations which will allow a communications company to own most or all of the sources of news in a community. The regulations currently in effect are serving the public well and should not be tampered with for private gain or power.

The public airways belong to the public. We are not served when the sources of our information fall into fewer and fewer hands. If a company could control what we see on TV and the Internet and also what we read in the newspapers, it could propagate any falsehoods, omit critical news, or give us the most slanted coverage without our being the wiser.

Please do not abdicate your responsibility to administer the FCC fairly. Our very democracy is at peril unless you do so.

Very worriedly yours,

Fern L. Leopold
21284 Plaza View Drive
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

From: Robert & Linda Manley
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:49 PM
Subject: deregulation

Dear Mr. Copps,

I watched your interview last night on NOW with Bill Moyers. I am very much against the possibility of a decision to eliminate the ban on media cross-ownership and ease other ownership regulations. It seems to me that the fewer organizations in the "mix," the worse for the public.

Thank you for bringing this subject to my attention.

Sincerely,

Linda Manley
owner
www.manleycrafts.com

From: Compostgal@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:53 PM
Subject: Don't vote June 2 if you want Democracy

Commissioner Abernathy kabernat@fcc.gov

Dear Commissioner Abernathy -

This further concentration of media is appalling
Here is my letter to Chairman Powell, he may be chair, but you are all
responsible for the common good. That is the bottom line, not someone's
profits
Thank you for doing the RIGHT thing,
Democratize the media, not consolidate it
Trina Paulus

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
1-888-225-5322
Fax 1-202-418-0710
www.fcc.gov

Dear Chairman Powell -

I already find the concentration of corporate power in the media intolerable
for getting at the truth in anything

I heard you say that big is not always bad, but monopoly of the media is so
limiting to voices that need to be heard in a Democracy, that big is really
bad in this case

You just can't push this vote June 2 if you want Democracy

My point about the problem is proven in that, the already big media has not
gone to any length to tell us about this event which will affect us all
These are OUR airwaves, not theirs or yours

Also, they hardly mentioned the changes before the vote in 1996. We have
creeping control by a few and disenfranchisement to the many. So much was in
that 1996 decision I do not approve of, and now you are pushing for more

Don't do it

Sincerely,
Trina Paulus

86 Elm Street
Montclair NJ 07042
973-746-8715
fax -973-509-1326
compostgal@aol.com

From: Allan Stewart-Oaten
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 8 01 PM
Subject: Re Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

I urge you to oppose strongly any further consolidation of the media, in the name of "deregulation", "efficiency", "economies of scale" or anything else

I believe a diverse, opinionated media is crucial to our survival as a democracy

Tyranny does not require direct government control, or physical intimidation. The contest for the same majority audience (which has led to crowds of rock/pop/country and almost eliminated classical), and mutuality of economic interests or ideology of a few dominant interests can suffice.

We have already gone too far along this road. News Corporation, Viacom, Disney, General Electric and Clear Channel now appear to control most of TV and radio. News Corp controls significant print media, and News Corp and Viacom have increasing involvement in the Internet.

This would be bad even if these enormous conglomerates were dedicated only to the medium or their own immediate economic interests. But News Corp and Clear Channel especially have been quite open about choosing "news" and other programs that match their ideology as well - something that would not be possible had deregulation brought about the competition we have often been promised. Performers, journalists and other public figures know very well that they must "watch what they say" if they want favorable or even neutral treatment by these two.

The power of News Corp is a particular concern, since it has enormous influence, amounting to partial control, overseas as well.

I hope you will not only oppose further deregulation of the media, but try to reintroduce measures to promote the fairness and diversity we had twenty years ago.

Yours sincerely

Allan Stewart-Oaten
Department of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology (EEMB)
University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB)
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9610, USA
805-893-3696 stewart@lifesci.ucsb.edu

From: Forrester Nicolson
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 8 06 PM
Subject: NO! to further media consolidation

Dear Commissioner Copps For your information, we have sent the following e-mail to FCC Chairman Powell

Dear Chairman Powell

In our personal working experience and in a lifetime of following the media, we are sure that further media consolidation is not in the public interest of this nation

Instead of the great variety of voices and outlets our country once had, citizens now are limited to the deadening sameness and stifling commercialism of corporate-owned media Consolidation of ownership has already reduced the number of voices to a handful More media mergers and takeovers would be disastrous for the democratic values of our Republic

Please do not rush this issue to a vote without adequate public notice and discussion!

Judith and Forrester Nicolson
7 Wall Street
Wellesley, MA 02481-4818

From: gordonkb@att.net
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 8:21 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Gentlemen & Madam

Please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules that current protect us from big media monopolies

The proposed changes will enable giant media conglomerates to obtain near-total control of R&T news and information in cities and towns across the country. Companies like Disney and Viacom who are lobbying you to relax these rules already have a history of keeping opposing views off the air.

We deserve to hear more than one viewpoint on important issues. For the sake of our 1st Amendment, I urge you to maintain the broadcast ownership protections that have helped keep healthy political debate alive in our country for all these years.

Sincerely,

Gordon Brown
Far Hills, NJ 07931